

REMARKS

The amendments herein do not introduce any new matter. It is believed that the claims herein should be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, allowance is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action dated February 26, 2003, the Examiner repeated the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection set forth in the Office Action dated July 16, 2002.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,399,456 to Zalm (“Zalm”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,052 to Guralnick (“Guralnick”) as set forth in the previous Office Action mailed on July 16, 2002.

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to combine the device of Zalm with the device of Guralnick by providing a universal product capable of displaying both interlaced and non-interlaced images. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Guralnick with Zalm to produce the invention as recited in the claims.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12, 16, 20 and 21 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. The present invention, as recited in amended claim 1, is directed to a method for controlling a line blanker which converts a stereoscopic image into a line-blanked stereoscopic image. Importantly, the line blanker control signal is embedded within the

stereoscopic image to enable or disable the line blanker. The control signal is additionally embedded within the first line signal of the line-blanked image. The present invention is further defined in recited claims 12, 16, 20 and 21. Claims 12, 16, 20 and 21 are directed to a line blanker that converts a stereoscopic image into a line-blanked stereoscopic image viewable by a viewer wearing shutter glasses. The line blanker includes a line buffer, an image fabrication unit, a line processor and a control unit. Importantly, the control unit enables and disables the line blanker based on the control signal embedded within the first line signal of the line-blanked image.

None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest enabling and disabling the line blanking through a control signal embedded within the first line signal of the line-blanked image. Zalm is directed to a three-dimensional television picture display system through periodic line blanking of the system. However, Zalm is silent as to enabling or disabling the line blanking system actuatable by any control signal embedded within the first line signal of the line-blanked image. Similarly, Guralnick is directed to a video signal processor for connecting a computer video output and a monitor that transforms non-interlaced video output to interlaced video output. Guralnick discloses a primitive line blanking system but importantly does not disclose any kind of a control system for controlling the line blanking capabilities. Guralnick does not teach or suggest enabling or disabling the line blanking system through a control signal embedded within the first line signal of the line-blanked image.

The Examiner is reminded that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of

ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings.


Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Since the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, either alone or in combination with each other, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 12, 16, 20 and 21 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 2-11, 13-15 and 17-19, by their dependency on amended independent claims 1, 12 and 16 are similarly allowable.

II. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims 1-21 are now in condition for allowance. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Bosco B. Kim
Registration No. 41,896

Date: June 30, 2004
REVEO, INC.
85 Executive Boulevard
Elmsford, New York 10523
Telephone (914) 345-9555
Facsimile: (914) 345-9558